

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 12-13 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-9 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 7, 12, and 13 each recite arranging droplets whose width is smaller than that of the film pattern. The Examiner alleges, however, that there is no support for this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As stated in response to the previous Office Action, referring to Figures 2A-2D, there can be seen a first pattern forming area (R1) in which a film pattern is to be formed; and a second pattern forming area (R2) in which another film pattern is to be formed. The droplets (Wa, Wb, and Wc) are arranged in each of the first and second pattern forming areas (R1 and R2) to form the film patterns and have a width that is less than that of the film pattern. Because this feature is sufficiently supported by the specification as originally filed, claims 1-9 and 12-13 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 7 are amended. Claim 1 now recites that “the droplets arranged in each of the side of the first pattern forming area and the center of the second pattern forming area [contact] each other.” See, for example, Figure 2B where droplets Wa arranged at the side of the first pattern forming area R1 contact each other, and droplets Wc arranged at the center of the second pattern forming area R2 contact each other. No new matter is added.

Claim 7 now recites that “the droplets arranged in each of the first step, the second step, and the third step contact each other.” See, for example, Figures 2A-2D where droplets Wa, Wb, and Wc arranged in each step contact each other. No new matter is added.

Akahira is completely silent with respect to the above-noted features of claims 1 and 7. Claims 1-2 and 4-7, therefore, are not anticipated. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection, therefore, is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahira et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981); and claim 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981) in view of

Nakamura, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0184613) and Pan (U.S. Pat. No. 6,501,663). .
These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 8, and 9 depend from either claim 1 or claim 7, addressed above, and are neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the same reasons.

Claims 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akahira, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,981) in view of Nakamura, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0184613). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12 and 13 are amended similarly to claims 1 and 7, addressed above. That is, claim 12 now recites that “the droplets arranged in each of the side of the first pattern forming area and the center of the second pattern forming area [contact] each other” and claim 13 now recites that “the droplets arranged in each of the first step, the second step, and the third step contact each other.” As stated above, Akahira is completely silent with respect to these features. Nakamura is also completely silent with respect to these features. Because both Akahira and Nakamura are silent with respect to these features, claims 12 and 13 are not obvious.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections, therefore, are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 22, 2008

By: /Bryant E. Wade/
G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH